

February 25, 1994 LB 642

persuaded that the two years ought to be restricted to one. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Ashford. The Chair recognizes Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Madam President. Members of the Legislature, I just...before we get going down the slippery slope here, I want to make sure we understand what we're doing. And, Senator Bromm, you talked about this. This is not a statute of limitations bill. You still have your four...even if this bill passes you still have your contract remedies and rights. What this is, is a violation of the disclosure. And if you look at the back part of this you still have the right to enter into a contract, there is implied warranties of habitability, there's all those things. And if you put in the contract some of those other warranties, or there's the implied ones that you'll never get rid of, this is for violations of the disclosure part. And if you'll look on the last page, if a conveyance of the properties not being in compliance the purchaser shall have a cause of action against the seller for damages. The cause of action created shall be in addition to any and all other causes of action the purchaser shall have. So you're not doing away with the four year statute of limitations on the contract, what this is, is an additional one for not doing the disclosure and not following this procedure. So you're not doing away with all your contract rights. I just wanted to make sure that the body understands that you're not going from four years to one year. You've still got all those other things there. And I think, Senator Schellpeper, maybe that's what we're doing here. What you're really looking at, and I don't see Senator Lindsay here, but I would hope that there's another cosponsor of the bill, maybe they could stand up and explain their intent to it. But I don't believe either, Senator Ashford, that we're doing away with the statute of limitations, that this is just another cause of action. What this is, again, as I try to explain that, if you don't give the disclosure statement then you have...actually you've made it easier for people to sue you in that one year. But even if the whole thing goes to pieces, and Senator Wesely still has water in his basement, he can still go sue within his contract period. So, with that, I don't think we're doing the damage that we appeared or think that we may be doing. So I guess I'd support the amendment. I might follow in Senator Hall's footsteps, but I don't think the amendment is all that bad. Thank you.